State of South Dakota
RFP# 1380 Round 2 Questions
Eligibility and Enrollment System Modernization
State of South Dakota Response to All Vendor Questions - Round 2

Question No.	RFP Area	Section	Question Topic	Question	State Response
1	Minimum Qualifications	5.1.7.4	Vendor Office	Given that the Project Manager, Business Lead, Technical Lead and Implementation Team Lead no longer have to be based on-site, and the significant costs associated with an on-site office, would the state consider removing the requirement that the vendor secure office space in Pierre.	The State anticipates the need for many meetings during the implementation phase and has several other DSS projects competing for meeting space. The State prefers that the service provider acquire office space in Pierre for the 21 months of expected implementation. Service Providers can propose alternative approaches to ensuring meeting rooms will be available for scheduled meetings.
2	Corporate Qualifications	6.4.1.4	"Provide the names of any State government agencies with which the prospective service provider has done similar business; include contracting entities, contact names, and phone numbers."	We have a significantly large number of client agencies where we provide similar services within the US. Will the State be willing to consider the contact names and phone numbers to be provided for the top two (Per RFP ask of minimum two Prior projects) and remaining to be provided upon request.	Provide the state a list of E&E system projects with all of the contact information required. The State defines similar to be any E&E system implementation.
3	The Legacy Infrastructure and Architecture	3.4.1	"The ACCESS mainframe uses Web Methods Enterprise Service Bus (ESB) to communicate with the FDSH and FFM."	Would the State be amenable in reusing the technology being leveraged from another State instead of continuing to use Web Methods? If not, can the State provide additional deployment details including version of web methods, on-prem/cloud, existing security infrastructure?	The State will permit the reuse of technology other than Web Methods Enterprise Service Bus (ESB) to communicate with the FDSH and FFM as long as the technology is currently in use in another State with the proposed solution. The State is not requiring the re-use of our current Web Methods ESB.
4	The Legacy Infrastructure and Architecture	3.4.3	"ACCESS is a mainframe system used by State staff, with proper security credentials, who are connected to the State network."	Does the State expect that the project office will be connected to the state network? If so, can the State provide guidelines for connectivity to the state network (e.g. VPN, protocols, guidelines, etc.)?	The State does not expect the service provider to access the ACCESS mainframe. The State expects that the new solution will be accessed via the internet which we expect the Service provider will need to connect their solution to the State network connection to the internet. If this is not how the Service provider envisions State staff accessing their solution, please provide your explanation in your proposal.

5	Training Activities	4.10.2.8, 4.10.2.9	“Prior to Go Live, an on-line training program/module suitable for State Personnel; “Prior to Go Live, separate and distinct online training program/module(s) suitable for customers, suppliers and other stakeholders other than State Personnel.”	Does the State have the capacity to host webinars through a system like WebEx that would support distributive learning for both internal and external learners?	For Clarity, Sections 4.10.1.1, 4.10.1.2, and 4.10.1.3 require in person delivery of UAT training, train the trainer, and post Hypercare and Warranty Period training, respectively. If distributed learning is a training modality for any other training events in the proposed training plan required in Section 4.10.2.3, the Service provider shall be required to have the capacity to host webinars through a system like WebEx. Sections 4.10.2.8 and 4.10.2.9 require the service provider to develop online training modules; it does not require the delivery of the training. The State has the capacity to host and support distributive learning for internal and external learners where appropriate, however this does not relieve the service provider from performing in person training as noted in the RFP. The State prefers Skype for business as the hosting software if the Service provider is planning to propose some level of state hosted learning.
6	Cost Proposal Template Instructions	Cost Proposal: Exhibit 9.9.4.g	“Service Providers must complete this detailed line item cost template for operations costs during M&O period. Operations includes staffing costs and non-personnel costs such as rent, utilities, computers, fax machines, etc. Service providers may add rows and columns if needed, but may not delete any columns from the template. Service Providers must add a grand total line for the entire table that corresponds to the total price entered in the Summary level Maintenance and Operations Cost Table.”	Would the State be willing to accept published labor rates by level effort?	The State expects actual costs are included in the cost proposal. The State will review all cost proposals to ensure we can establish how final costs were determined. The Service provider should propose whatever they can support as the costs for both the DDI phase and the M&O phase.
7	Exchange Reference Architecture: Foundation Guidance	4.1.2.36	Scope of Work	Will the State please provide the content or URL(s) for the Exchange Reference Architecture: Foundation Guidance? Several online CMS documents reference it; however, the definitive location of the content is still unclear.	Exchange Reference Architecture: Foundation Guidance, as well as Acceptable Risk Controls can be located at the following: https://www.cms.gov/CCIIO/Resources/Files/Downloads/exchange_medicaid_it_guidance_05312011.pdf https://www.cms.gov/CCIIO/Resources/Regulations-and-Guidance/Downloads/Catalog-of-MinAcceptable-Risk-Controls-for-Exchanges-ERA-Supp-v-1-0-08012012-a.pdf
8	Q 1.1	5.4 Response to Attachment E and F	Scope of Work	Would the State be willing to mark which requirements in Attachment E and F are deemed mandatory?	The State issued a clarifying statement as a part of Amendment 1 that indicated what was mandatory within E&F. Proposals should clearly indicate what is included in the proposed cost.

9	Q 1.1	5.4 Response to Attachment E & F	Scope of Work	The State has designated that service provider may mark a requirement as "M" and provide an alternate solution. Would the State please clarify if there is a preferred way you suggest service providers mark a requirement that the solution does not plan to meet?	If there are Functional requirements the proposed solution does not currently meet and there are no plans to meet it, place an X in column C (Custom) and include "No plan to meet" in the Vendor Response to Meeting column. For Non Functional requirements, service providers should place an X in the Does Not Meet column of Attachment F and include "No plan to meet" in the Vendor Narrative Response. Proposals should clearly describe what is included in the proposal costs.
10	Introduction	Q&A Responses: Q 1	Program Coverage	Would the State consider moving Optional Supplemental Payment and End Stage Renal Programs from Covered Programs to Optional Programs, as these are not commonly grouped with Non-MAGI development as they require extensive work around services and payments?	The Service provider may propose to implement these programs in a separate "phase" within the overall 21 month timeframe, but these programs must be included as Covered Programs.
11	6.4 Service Provider Qualifications	6.4.6.10 6.4.6.11 6.4.6.12	Prior Projects	The State has already said that "True un-customized (for any State) COTS products that have not been implemented already in another state are not desired." Is the State open to a COTS solution that meets many of South Dakota's requirements out of the box, but does not include customizations and configurations from another state, if the vendor believes that such an approach is less costly and less risky to South Dakota? Please note that this refers to a COTS solution that has already been implemented in other states.	A COTS solution has been certified/approved by CMS for any state implementation is acceptable.
12	11.2 (Q 127)	Liability	Governing Liability	In the State's responses to previous questions, it described section of Attachment K where the vendor could propose alternative amounts or percentages. Section 11.2, governing liability, was not included in this list. Can the Service Provider propose alternative amounts or exceptions to items in this section?	No. The State listed all areas in Attachment K where the State is willing to negotiate or accept alternative language.
13	6.4 Service Provider Qualifications (Q 147)	6.4.6.10 6.4.6.11 6.4.6.12 6.4.6.13 6.4.6.14	Prior Projects	Since the Scope and Change Requests and the documentation that is used to monitor, track, and approve them are owned by the State Procurement Office and not by the Service Provider, we are not able to provide the level of detail the State is requesting. Would it be acceptable for the Service Provider to provide contacts so that this can be a state-to-state request during the reference verification period?	The State requires that the service provider to provide, in a table format, a list of all change requests to original scope for prior projects. For each change request, the service provider should include: • Description of request • Description of changes completed • Description of how requests were addressed or completed • Description of whether the project was completed on schedule • Description of whether the project was completed according to original budget It is the expectation of the State that service providers incorporate change management processes that track requests. The Service provider can provide a state contact for South Dakota to validate response to this section.

14	6.4.6.15 (Q 147)	References	Prior Projects	Contract actions between the Service Provider and states are confidential and we are not able to include this information in the response without confirmation from our customers. Will the State consider asking this question during the reference check process?	The Service Provider is required to state if there is any litigation associated with any E&E system implementation. The State will add this to the reference check process. Please provide appropriate State contacts.
15	(Q.1)	General Information	Purpose and Contents	As long as the Service Provider meets the project qualifications outlined in the RFP, would the State be open to reconsidering limitation of covered program scope to MAGI only to address the State's desire for a low cost, low risk, fixed price solution that can be implemented quickly and successfully resulting in a quick win for the State?	As discussed in section 1.1, covered programs are listed as: the State's Medicaid, CHIP, Optional Supplemental Payment and End Stage Renal Programs. For Medicaid this includes the MAGI and NON-MAGI Populations. The State would consider separate implementations of MAGI and CHIP, followed by Non-MAGI within the overall goal of implementing the solution no later than 21 months after project initiation. The State will not reduce the scope of covered programs to just MAGI only.
16	9.0 Cost Proposal (Q 20)	9.9.4g: Detailed Cost Operations During Maintenance and Operations Phase	Pricing	In a fixed price bid, it is unusual to calculate cost with salary and fringe. This approach is typically used in Federal contracts. Also, salary and fringe alone do not represent the total cost of labor. Overhead, general administrative expenses are also included. Fixed price bids allow for better discounting of actual costs to provide the State the best overall value. Will the State consider changing this schedule to reflect the total annual personnel costs included in the cost?	Service providers are instructed to add any columns or rows necessary to clarify what is in their costs. Submit your bid with the additional items you mention in your question if that is a better representation of costs.
17	9.0 Cost Proposal (Q76)	9.9.1b: Summary Costs – Operations and Maintenance	Pricing	Question 76 of the Questions and Responses document confirms that pricing should be provided for the 6-year base term and 2 optional years. Where should Service Providers include pricing for the two renewal periods?	Using the format in Exhibit 9.9.1 b – Summary Costs – Maintenance and Operations - Service providers should add two columns for year 7 and Year 8 pricing AFTER the "Totals" column.
18	9.0 Cost Proposal	9.94: Detailed Costs – Operations and Maintenance	Pricing	The State's instructions require that the detailed schedules roll up and support the Summary Schedules. The Summary Schedules may include annual inflationary amounts. Will the State allow the Service Providers to show the annual operations cost as representative of one full year of operations rather than rolling up exactly to the Summary Schedules?	The Cost proposal is a critical piece of the evaluation and the State will scrutinize all final costs contained in the Summary schedules. The Service provider must be able to show, via the detailed cost tables, how the final summary level costs were arrived at. The instructions indicate that service providers can add rows or columns to any of the detailed sheets to account for any additional cost categories.
19	1.1 Question 138	Q&A Responses Q: 1	State Resources	Given the magnitude of requirements within the RFP, will the State be able to accommodate Vendor implementation timelines to deliver the proposed solution within 21 months given the State envisions having on a core team of 8 State staff?	The State plans to supplement the State project staff with additional contractor staff to assist with Testing and other tasks, as needed.

20	Attachment F	KMT 18	Knowledge Management, Transfer, and Training	The State mentions in KMT 18 "files loaded with copies of production cases" for the training environment. Typically training environments are loaded with non-PHI "fake" data. Would the State please clarify?	Please see the answer to question #101 in the first round of questions. For the purposes of the training environment, copies of production cases refers to simulated or mocked-up cases. Service providers can de-identify data to ensure we stay compliant and protect PHI and PII.
21	Training	3.4.9.1 (RFP: 4.10.1)	Training Audience	Moving to a modern solution will require significant training and re-orientation for not only EA staff, but other State stakeholders including customers, contractors, and personnel in other DSS divisions. Would the State please provide more detail regarding "personnel in other DSS divisions?" For example, what roles will be included, what departments/agencies, and how many individuals will this group represent? This information will help us more accurately determine the training needs of the State.	The State believes that a limited number of staff in the DSS Divisions of Medical Assistance, Child Support, Child Care as well as BIT staff will need to be trained on some parts of the system. They will be users who need "inquiry only" access to summary level information for the most part. BIT staff may need to be trained on how to generate reports out of the new solution in addition to some inquiry capabiliteis. The Department of Human Services, Division of Long Term Services and Supports will need both inquiry and some limited update capabilities in the new system. As a reminder, the following clauses detail service provider responsibilities for training. Sections 4.10.1.1, 4.10.1.2, and 4.10.1.3 require in person delivery of UAT training, train the trainer, and post Hypercare and Warranty Period training, respectively. If distributed learning is a training modality for any other training events in the proposed training plan required in Section 4.10.2.3, the Service provider shall be required to have the capacity to host webinars through a system like WebEx. Sections 4.10.2.8 and 4.10.2.9 require the service provider to develop online training modules; it does not require the delivery of the training.
22	Training	3.4.9.1 (RFP: 4.10.2.2)	Clarification	Please provide more explanation regarding the objective of the pre-go live training event. Will this event encompass the training end users are required to receive? Does the State envision this event to include anything in addition to the required training?	The pre-go live training event refers to the in person, train the trainer event described in Section 4.10.1.2.
23	Help Desk	General	Clarification	Given the State's limited budget, would the State be willing to reconsider the requirements of the service desk? In this case, the State could leverage the systems and resources in place under the existing help desk to support the level 2 help desk instead of standing up a new operation. This would enable to provided staff to serve as a single point of contact for systems-related issues and use the existing systems to avoid duplication. Would the State be open to taking a consolidated approach to help desk level support augmenting the existing help desk with vendor support?	To clarify, the State is retaining the function of level 1 help desk. The Service provider is required to provide level 2 support in accordance with the RFP.

24	Attachment E- Functional Requirements Matrix	Person Master Index, Page 84	Follow-up State to use all third-party software and other products required to run the E&E System.	Question 113 of Round 1 Q&A, "Item PMI 1 reads, "The system shall include a Person Master Index (PMI) that interfaces with multiple systems, or reuse the State's PMI." Please describe the State's current Person Master Index?" State Response, "The State would like the Service provider to describe the current solutions PMI record and how they would communicate with the Legacy solutions PMI record to ensure we keep unique member records. We do not want to re-use the current PMI in the legacy solution and the RFP will be amended accordingly." Follow-up Question, For solution planning/estimation purposes, what are the other programs in and/or Divisions that have records in the current PMI? How many records are in the current PMI?	The following programs have some form of interface to the PMI to either create records or pull information. • Medicaid/CHIP Eligibility • SNAP • TANF • Child Support • LIEAP • Child Care • Child Protection • Office of Recoveries and Fraud Investigations (ORFI) • Medical Services (Claims, MARS Reporting, Managed care and Health Homes) • Electronic Benefit Transfer (EBT) • Electronic Funds Transfer (EFT) These programs are covered under the Divisions of : Economic Assistance, Medical Services, Child Care, Child Support Enforcement, Legal Services, Child Protective Services Please refer to the answer in Round 1 questions regarding how many records we intend to convert for purposes of determining how many records PMI.